



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,838	01/16/2004	Mu-Liang Liao	NAUP0511USA	1837
27765	7590	09/23/2004	EXAMINER	
NAIPO (NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE) P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116				THOMAS, DAVID B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3723		

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/707,838	LIAO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David B. Thomas	3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 9-14 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 15-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 24 recites the limitation "wherein the EBR process" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kunisawa et al. (6,558,239).

Kunisawa et al. ('239) disclose an all-in-one polishing process for a semiconductor wafer, the semiconductor wafer being positioned on a polishing platen of a chemical mechanical polishing (CMP) device and comprising a top surface, a bottom surface and an edge bevel surface, the edge bevel surface

comprising a front side bevel, a backside bevel and an edge, the top surface comprising at least a first material layer, the edge bevel surface comprising a second material layer, the polishing process comprising: performing a surface CMP process by utilizing a polishing pad to remove the first material layer on the top surface to a first thickness; performing a rim CMP process to completely remove the second material layer on the front side bevel, the backside bevel and the edge; performing a first cleaning process to clean the top surface, the front side bevel, the backside bevel, the edge, and the surface of the semiconductor wafer; and drying the semiconductor wafer; as well as the remaining limitations as claimed in claims 2-7.

6. Claims 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hakomori (2003/0134570).

Hakomori ('570) discloses a wafer edge polishing system for a wafer having a notch, the polishing process including: performing a rim CMP process to completely remove the second material layer on the front side bevel, the backside bevel and the edge; performing a first cleaning process to clean the top surface, the front side bevel, the backside bevel and the edge of the semiconductor wafer; and drying the semiconductor wafer.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 9-14 are allowed.

8. Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3723

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: It is the examiner's opinion that the prior art of record considered as a whole, alone or in combination, neither anticipates nor renders obvious the all-in-one apparatus for polishing a semiconductor wafer including a polishing platen; a wafer stage; a polishing pad; a notch pad for locating the coordination of the semiconductor wafer on the wafer stage; a plurality of rollers for fixing the semiconductor wafer on the wafer stage; at least one front side bevel pad; at least one backside bevel pad; at least one edge pad; at least one slurry supply tube; and at least one cleaning solution supply tube, among other limitations, together in combination with the rest of the limitations in the independent claim.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ashjaee et al., Basol, Fukunaga et al., Inoue et al., Katayama et al., Kimura et al., Moinpour et al., and Nagai et al. each disclose semiconductor wafer processing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David B. Thomas whose telephone number is (703) 308-4250. The examiner can normally be reached on 7-4 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail can be reached on (703) 308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David B. Thomas
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3723

dbt